REMARKS

In accordance with the foregoing, claim 3 has been cancelled and claims 1, 2, 4, 15 and 16 have been amended. Claims 1, 2 and 4-16 are pending and under consideration.

In item 2, the Examiner rejects claims 16 under 35 U.S.C. § 101. The Examiner's suggested claim change has been incorporated to overcome this rejection.

In item 5, claims 1, 2, 15 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,577,753 to Ogawa. The remaining dependent claims are rejected as being obvious over Ogawa in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,502,984 to Ogura et al. U.S. Patent No. 6,314,498 to Ogura is additionally relied upon for claim 4.

Ogawa is a new reference cited in response to Applicant's previous arguments. This reference describes performing tone correction based on the type of the imaging apparatus. Column 5, lines 33-43 provide as follows:

> In this manner, when the image information S0 has been obtained by the CT apparatus 1a, the LUT 21a is used for example, and the output tone characteristic of the output image signal S2 is changed in such a manner that the tone characteristic of B is upwardly convex compared to that of R and G, as shown in FIG. 3(A). When the image information S0 has been obtained by the MRI apparatus 1b, the LUT 21b is used, and the output tone characteristic of the output image signal S2 is changed so that the tone characteristic of G is upwardly convex compared to that of R and B, as shown in FIG. 3(B).

In response to the current Office Action, limitations similar to dependent claim 3 have been incorporated into the Independent claims , and claim 3 has been cancelled. In addition, the independent claims have been amended to clarify that gradation conversion processing and frequency emphasis processing are performed differently for different imaging devices and different imaging conditions.

Ogawa does not mention that gradation conversion and frequency emphasis is preformed differently based on different the photography devices. Ogawa is simply concerned with enabling both monochrome images and color images to be viewed. Column 1, lines 50-55 provide as follows:

> Col. 1, 50-55:
> Since images to be displayed are mixture of monochrome images, such as CT images, and colored images, such as MRI images, an image display apparatus enabling color display is used as a component of the diagnostic workstation and an image to be displayed in monochrome is usually displayed on the image display apparatus by input of its image signal into the RGB input of the display

apparatus.

On page 4 of the Office Action, the Examiner recognizes that Ogawa does not teach gradation conversion processing and frequency emphasis processing, as claimed.

The Examiner cites Ogura et al. for this deficiency. However, Ogura et al., like Ogawa, does not suggest that gradation conversion processing and frequency emphasis processing are performed differently for different imaging devices.

Applicants see no reason why it would have been obvious to incorporate the claimed gradation conversion processing and frequency emphasis processing into Ogawa. Even if Ogura et al. taught these features, Ogawa is only concerned with enabling both monochrome images and color images to be viewed.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks it is submitted that prior art rejection should be withdrawn.

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: June 30 2006

By: M J Henry

Mark J. Henry
Registration No. 36,162

1201 New York Avenue, NW, 7th Floor
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501

CERTIFICATE OF FACSIMILE TRANSMISSION
I hereby certify that this correspondence is being transmitted via facsimile to: Commissioner for Patents P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, VA 22313-1450
on June 30, 2006
STAAS & HALSEY
By: M. Gellert
Date June 30, 06